DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 011 EA 022 744

AUTHOR Valesky, Thomas C.; Etheridge, Carol Plata
TITLE A Partnership of Memphis City Schools and Memphis State University for Data-Based Decision Making in Seven Schools Using School Based Decision Making: A Perspective from the University.
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (New Orleans, LA, March 1-4, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Decision Making; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Public Schools; School Based Management; Shared Resources and Services; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Memphis City Schools TN; Memphis State University TN

ABSTRACT

A school-university partnership between Memphis State University and seven innercity schools, designed to enhance informed decision making by the schools through provision of university data, is described in this report. Data about the partnership process were collected from observations, document analyses, and interviews with all constituents. Three survey instruments that were developed in conjunction with a school-university collaborative program, Positive Attitudes in Tennessee Schools (PATS), were also administered to participating teachers, administrators, parents, and students. Findings suggest two values of school-college collaboration: (1) provision of resources to schools and supply of sources for university research; and (2) the generation of objective evaluation of reform efforts. Positive outcomes of the collaboration include the changing role of university researchers as collaborators and the improvement of school professionals' attitudes toward evaluation, resulting in recognition of their symbiotic relationship. Appendices include a group process and decision-making inventory, project evaluation findings, and a list of indicators of progress toward long-range goals. (6 references) (LMI)

A Partnership of Memphis City Schools and Memphis State University for Data-Based Decision Making in Seven Schools Using School Based Decision Making: A Perspective from the University

Thomas C. Valesky and Carol Plata Etheridge
Memphis State University

Paper presented in the symposium, Educational Improvement Through School-University Alliances: Use of learning environment profiles for decision making and planning.

Annual meeting of The American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA, March 1-4, 1991

Support for this report was provided by the Center for Research in Educational Policy, College of Education, Memphis State University. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Center, the College, of the University. The Center for Research in Educational Policy is a Center of Excellence for the State of Tennessee.

A Partnership of Memphis City Schools and Memphis State University for Data-Based Decision Making in Seven Schools Using School Based Decision Making: A Perspective from the University

Thomas C. Valesky and Carol Plata Etheridge
Memphis State University

A major school-university partnership has emerged between Memphis State University (MSU) and seven inner city schools using School Based Decision Making (SBDM) in the Memphis City School District (MCS). This alliance has been formed with one primary goal: To improve the learning environment in the schools. Simply put, the university provides the data necessary for the schools to make informed decisions.

The project began in the 1989-90 academic year through the efforts of two people: a MSU researcher (Carol Etheridge) and the school district superintendent (Dr. W. W. Herenton). The MSU researcher was interested in the process of SBDM and its subsequent potential to alter, in a positive manner, the learning environments in schools. The superintendent wanted to incorporate a research component into the district's experiment with SBDM. One research question was identified by the superintendent and supported by the MSU researcher: Is School Based Decision Making effective in helping improve the learning environments for the students in these schools? Thus began a partnership that has resulted in a university research team composed of five faculty, two consultants, three graduate assistants, several volunteers, and a variety of support personnel for data collection, entry and reporting. As in any research/evaluation project, many resources are needed to collect, analyze and report the data in appropriate formats and through proper venues. Fortunately, the Center for Research in Educational Policy at Memphis State University (a Center of Excellence funded by the state of Tennessee) provides resources to

make available the MSU project team and graduate assistants, making the partnership currently free to the school district (Bowman,1991).

The original core research team at MSU is interdisciplinary in nature and composed of four faculty, two from a department of curriculum and instruction, one from educational psychology, and one from educational administration. The group has expanded to include the principal of the university's lab school and two faculty consultants, one from a department of anthropology and one from sociology. The original core research team established a research agenda to assist the schools in their decision making as the implementation of SBDM proceeded.

The primary data to be collected and analyzed are catagorized in four areas: (a) the process of implementing SBDM in the seven schools, (b) the means by which decision making processes occur in each of the schools, (c) the changes in school culture related to SBDM, and (d) the changes in student achievement and other indicators of school improvement (student achievement; suspension rates; attendance rates; dropout rates; teacher turnover and attendance: school vandalism; and parent involvement). Baseline data were collected during the planning year (1989-90). Data were collected on items (a), (b), and (c) above. Item (d) above will be analyzed after the second year of implementing school improvement plans (1991-92) to give the plans time to have effect.

With process/product evaluation designs, programs and affiliated outcomes have the potential to be improved, replicated, or avoided. This position was held when developing the research/evaluation plan for Memphis school based decision making sites. The documentation /evaluation strategy is two pronged. The first prong examines process. We are currently conducting structured observations at local school council meetings to record issues and decision making processes. These observations document the evolution of the types of issues arising and decisions made; who initiates issues; and who dominates discussions and decisions. Appendix A has a copy of the form entitled "School Council Group Process and Decision Making Inventory" which is used to record the

observations. Minutes from all local school councils meetings are transcribed in a uniform format. Logs are kept of training activities for teachers, principals, and council members. In addition, observers attend training activities, faculty meetings and parent meetings. Modifications to the original program design are recorded. Finally, participants from all constituent groups are interviewed. These data clarify processes and perspectives and enable comparisons between program design and program implementation as well as cross site comparisons. The data were analyzed and each school was provided with a year-end report in October 1990 (see Appendix A for an illustration of some key findings). The reports denote progress toward the implementation of SBDM and the success of efforts in meeting the schools' first-year goals. In addition, Dr. Etheridge has provided verbal summaries of her finding to the Board of Education and a summary report of the first year efforts to organize for SBDM (Etheridge, Hall, Brown, and Lucas, 1990). This data collection effort will continue through the end of the 1991-92 school year to insure completeness of data to determine successful practices over time. And as curriculum/program changes occur through school improvement plans, data collection will shift to 3-day visits by teams of three researchers each in the spring of 1991, in addition to continued observations of site council meetings and faculty meetings. Data collection will continue to focus on how SBDM is implemented in each of the seven schools and how decisions are being made. It is reasonable to expect that administrative and curricular reform in each school will be unique since all planning will be school -based and final decisions will reflect each school's needs. Therefore, some guiding research questions include: (a) How does each school implement its own management and design its own curriculum? (b) What are the barriers to implementation, how are they overcome? (c) What factors seem to be the most important to the successful implementation of SBDM?

The second prong by which data are being collected is through the administration of three survey instruments that measure the learning

environments of schools. These three instruments comprise the Learning Environment Assessment System (LEAS) developed by a group of researchers at The Center for Research in Educational Policy at Memphis State University in conjunction with a school-university-state collaborative entitled *Positive Attitudes in Tennessee Schools* (PATS). For a detailed description of these instruments and their use in the PATS project please refer to Butler (1991). Administered to the teachers, administrators, parents, and students, these questionnaires measure perceptions of school climate, classroom climate, and student self-concept as a learner. In addition, for the SBDM project, the instruments were modified to determine the perceived effectiveness of School Based Decision Making. Each instrument measures a number of constructs within its domain, and for each instrument factor analytic studies were completed and acceptable reliability coefficients obtained (Butler, Alberg, McNelis, Pike, and Chandler, 1990).

Baseline measures were obtained from all seven inner city SBDM schools in Memphis during the spring of 1990. An analysis of the data was conducted using t-tests and ANOVA tests to determine if significant differences could be found on a variety of independent variables (Valesky, Smith, and Horgan, 1990). Some illustration of the data is presented in Appendix B .

In addition, each school was provided with resulting scores on individual items in each questionnaire, and on the different factors within each questionnaire. Although no school was identified by name, all school scores were provided so that comparisons could be made. Each school has used the data in different ways and in varying degrees of use. In the formulation of their action plans some have made only limited use of the data available, while others have made substantial use of the data. Please refer to Evans (1991) for an example of how one school used the data provided. During the spring of 1991 each school will be visited by the MSU researchers to review the data from the previous year. to answer q. tions related to the findings, and to hear suggestions for ways in

which the data may be better presented for use by the school in the decision making processes.

In the late winter of 1991, the second administration of the instruments will occur. The seven schools will be provided, by school, with comparative data from the previous year. An example form entitled "Worksheet 1" shows an approach by which data will be reported (see Appendix B). These instruments will be administered again in the winter of 1992 so that long term effects of SBDM implementation on individual school cultures can be tracked.

Because each school setting is unique, this diverse documentation/evaluation strategy is necessary to explain why particular outcomes occur. The process-product approach enables association of outcomes with the combinations of variables that actually exist in the reform site(s), not simply in program design. Thus, complete understanding of the reform effort is possible and program implementers can make informed adjustments to increase chances of desired outcomes. In addition, the reform will be more readily replicated.

Long term objectives will result in complete case studies of each school that will also include process measures, climate measures, and an analysis of the traditional school outcome measures or success, including increasing attendance, increasing standardized test scores, decreasing vandalism, and other similar numerical outputs identified earlier in this paper. Appendix C includes a form entitled "Indicators of Success", listing the schools' long range goals and the data that will used to indicate success for each goal.

Concluding Remarks

For this partnership to work effectively, there must be a great deal of commitment to the project from both partners. The university must insure that the data which are provided the schools will be most helpful in the decision making process. And to assist in critical decision making, the results must be provided in a timely and effective manner. Some adjustments to the timing in the administration of the questionnaires has already been made, from mid-spring to

late-winter, to permit the schools to use the results in their spring planning sessions. This change was made based on school requests. And although it required changes in research agendas and time schedules for the university researchers, it was given top priority. For without the changes, the results would not be as effective for decisions related to school improvement plans for the following year.

Commitments from the school councils, faculty and administration are also required for this partnership to work. These commitments include the accurate administration of the assessment instruments, and the commitment to honestly answer the instrument and to emphasize to the students the importance of honest answers. Without these commitments the data would be meaningless. Additionally, the schools must be committed to using the data so that strengths and weaknesses can be identified in the learning environments and applied to programmatic changes that are, in fact, based on an analysis of meaningful data.

There are benefits to both partners in this collaborative. The school professionals receive a rich data set that can be used for decisions leading to programmatic changes that improve the learning environments. University researchers have opportunities to facilitate immediate positive changes in the schools even as they compile a database that can be used far beyond the immediate needs of the local school district. In this case, the database includes process data coupled with outcome data. This combination provides maximum direction to others wishing to implement school base decision making or any of the initiatives catagorized by new management forms. Finally, this diverse database will provide the basis for training materials, curriculums, and theoretical discussions.

This kind of documentation/evaluation suggests the need for collaboration between universities and school systems for two reasons. First, most school systems do not have resources for documentation/evaluation. Their monies are usually earmarked for program implementation and their personnel are not trained to evaluate programs or conduct research. Universities do not implement

school programs. However, since universities are charged with expanding knowledge, professors are expected to conduct research. Therefore, schools should look to universities to provide human resources for examining school reform initiatives. Thus, school practitioners and university researchers make a natural pairing.

Second, for obvious reasons, it not advisable for reform designers or implementers to do summative evaluation of their own reform efforts, but they should be involved with formative evaluation that enables revision and refinement of reforms so they are more likely to be successful. This is the focus of the collaboration. University personnel facilitate in several ways. First they collect a body of data. Second the data are compiled and returned back to the school. Finally, university personnel assist school personnel to read and interpret the data, so that school personnel can then use the data to make programmatic decisions.

Collaboration of this kind has at least two positive outcomes relative to school-university relationships: (a) University researchers are no longer the "police dogs" who sniff out evidence for the purpose of casting school based programs as successes or failures. Instead, the university researchers become collaborators who facilitate school decisions by providing data regarding school programs; (b) School professionals are no longer fearful of what the researcher/evaluators will say. Instead school professionals realize that they too are important data collectors and users. School professionals then begin to abandon the paranoia usually associated with program evaluation. Instead, they come to view program implementation as constantly evolving, and they realize that evaluation is a tool that informs where programs changes are desirable. Thus, program developers and researcher/evaluators become symbiotic in their relationship, each feeding and needing the other. University professors can be convenient, unbiased but interested third parties who can collaborate with school system personnel to examine, shape, and assess reform initiatives.

If a college professor is the only manpower and resource required, most school systems should be able to have third party evaluations of their programs. Unfortunately, other resources are also needed in order to complete a thorough study. Resources such as computer time, research assistants, and questionnaires are not readily available to school systems or universities. Thus, if the value and outcomes associated with reform efforts are to be understood, funding for school programs must be coupled with funding for research, documentation, and evaluation conducted by a third party. Otherwise, we will never know whether our program money has been put to good use.

References

Bowman, H. (1991, March). The center for research in educational policy: A model for school-university research collaboration. A paper presented in the symposium, Educational improvement through school-university alliances: Use of learning environment profiles for decision making and planning. Presented at the meeting of The American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA. (Available from The Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN, 38152).

Butler, E. D. (1991, March). Improving school climates through school -university alliances: First year results of a data-based educational reform initiative. A paper presented in the symposium, Educational improvement through school-university alliances: Use of learning environment profiles for decision making and planning. Presented at the meeting of The American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA. (Available from The Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN, 38152).

Butler, E. D., Alberg, M. J., McNelis, M. J., Pike, M., & Chandler, S. (1990, April). The PATS project: A state of Tennessee school reform initiative. Paper presented at the meeting of The American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (Available from The Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN, 38152).

Etheridge, C. P., Hall, M. L., Brown, N., & Lucas, S. (1990, October). Establishing school based decision making in seven urban schools in Memphis, Tennessee: The first year. (Available from The Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN, 38152).

Evans, D. (1991, March). Teachers, administrators, and parents together: The memphis model for managing schools through shared decision making. A paper presented in the symposium, Educational improvement through school -university alliances: Use of learning environment profiles for decision making and planning. Presented at the meeting of The American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA. (Available from The Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN, 38152).

Valesky, T., Smith, D., & Horgan, D. (1990, November). Baseline data on school climate, classroom climate, and self concept as a learner in schools using School Based Decision Making. Paper presented at a meeting of the Mid -South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (Available from The Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN, 38152).

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL COUNCIL GROUP PROCESS AND DECISION MAKING INVENTORY

School_____ Observer_____ Date_____

Number of people present in each category:
____parent
____administrator
____teacher
____student
____community member
____other (explain)

Diagram meeting room and seating arrangement below:

ISSUE/QUESTION	WHO BROUGHT ISSUE	DECISION PROCESS		OUTCOME	REACTION
1.	____parent ____principal ____other administrator ____teacher ____student ____community member ____committee ____other (specify) _____	Discussion ____calm ____emotional ____mixed ____none 0-3 Led by partic. ____parent_____ ____principal_____ ____teacher_____ ____other admin ___ ____student_____ ____comm. mem ___ ____committee ____other _____ ____no leader	__vote __consensus __compromise __assigned to committee __principal decided __tabled __no decision __other __implied consens __sought input from expert __asked superiors to decide		generally, group __pleased __disgruntled Discussion time __very short < 5 min __average __extended > 1/2 hr
ISSUE/QUESTION	WHO BROUGHT ISSUE	DECISION PROCESS		OUTCOME	REACTION
2.	____parent ____principal ____other administrator ____teacher ____student ____community member ____committee ____other (specify) _____	Discussion ____calm ____emotional ____mixed ____none 0-3 Led by partic. ____parent_____ ____principal_____ ____teacher_____ ____other admin ___ ____student_____ ____comm. mem ___ ____committee ____other _____ ____no leader	__vote __consensus __compromise __assigned to committee __principal decided __tabled __no decision __other __implied consens __sought input from expert __asked superiors to decide		generally, group __pleased __disgruntled Discussion time __very short < 5 min __average __extended > 1/2 hr

ISSUE/QUESTION	WHO BROUGHT ISSUE	DECISION PROCESS		OUTCOME	REACTION
	____parent	Discussion	__vote		generally, group
	____principal	___calm	__consensus		__pleased
	____other administrator	___emotional	__compromise		__disgruntled
	____teacher	___mixed	__assigned to		
	____student	___none 0-3	committee		
	____community member	Led by partic.	__principal		
	____committee	___parent ______	decided		
	____other (specify)	___principal _____	__tabled		
	________________	___teacher ______	__no decision		
		___other admin __	__other		
		___student ______	__implied consens		Discussion time
		___comm. mem __	__sought input		__very short < 5 min
		___committee	from expert		__average
		___other ______	__asked superiors		__extended > 1/2 hr
		___no leader	to decide		

ISSUE/QUESTION	WHO BROUGHT ISSUE	DECISION PROCESS		OUTCOME	REACTION
	____parent	Discussion	__vote		generally, group
	____principal	___calm	__consensus		__pleased
	____other administrator	___emotional	__compromise		__disgruntled
	____teacher	___mixed	__assigned to		
	____student	___none 0-3	committee		
	____community member	Led by partic.	__principal		
	____committee	___parent ______	decided		
	____other (specify)	___principal _____	__tabled		
	________________	___teacher ______	__no decision		
		___other admin __	__other		
		___student ______	__implied consens		Discussion time
		___comm. mem __	__sought input		__very short < 5 min
		___committee	from expert		__average
		___other ______	__asked superiors		__extended > 1/2 hr
		___no leader	to decide		

ISSUE/QUESTION	WHO BROUGHT ISSUE	DECISION PROCESS		OUTCOME	REACTION
	____parent	Discussion	__vote		generally, group
	____principal	___calm	__consensus		__pleased
	____other administrator	___emotional	__compromise		__disgruntled
	____teacher	___mixed	__assigned to		
	____student	___none 0-3	committee		
	____community member	Led by partic.	__principal		
	____committee	___parent ______	decided		
	____other (specify)	___principal _____	__tabled		
	________________	___teacher ______	__no decision		
		___other admin __	__other		
		___student ______	__implied consens		Discussion time
		___comm. mem __	__sought input		__very short < 5 min
		___committee	from expert		__average
		___other ______	__asked superiors		__extended > 1/2 hr
		___no leader	to decide		

SCHOOL COUNCIL GROUP PROCESS AND DECISION MAKING INVENTORY

Directions

1. The **School Council Group Process and Decision Making Inventory** provides a framework for observing and recording issues or questions dealt with during meetings and the processes by which they were dealt. The instrument is not designed to observe or record topics that are purely informational.

2. Observer should arrive and be seated before the meeting begins.

3. Name of school, observer, date, and number of people present should be entered before the meeting begins.

4. **Number of people in each category**: On the line next to each participant category enter the number indicating how many were present. Numbers should include latecomers to the meeting.

5. **Diagram meeting room and seating arrangement**: Draw a sketch of the meeting room including furniture arrangement and seating placement of participants. This should be completed before the meeting begins or as the meeting begins. Late arrivals should be accounted for whenever they arrive.

The following codes should be used to indicate meeting participants:

P for **parent**; people who are guardians of children enrolled in the school. They may be relatives like grandparents, uncles, or adoptive parents.
PR for school **principal** or person ultimately in charge of the school.
OA for **other administrators** such as assistant principals, or the guidance counselor in the school. This does not include administrators from central office.
T for **teacher**; any classroom teacher including specialists such as music, vocational, or special education teachers.
ST for **student**; a person enrolled in the school.
C for **community member**; a person living in the school's service zone but does not have children enrolled in the school.
OT for **other**; people who are **not** elected council members but may fit any of the above categories or representatives of central office staff or the professional association (union).
O for **observer**; the person completing the observation instrument

Use the back of the observation form to explain OT (other) entries.

6. **ISSUE/QUESTION**: Each time an issue or question is brought up enter it in the space provided. Only one issue or question should be entered in each space.

7. **WHO BROUGHT THE ISSUE**: For each issue or question place a check (✓) on the line next to the appropriate descriptor indicating who first brought the issue to the group or asked the question. If it is clear that the person who brought the issue is not the originator of the issue but is bringing it to the group as a representative of someone else, indicate this in the space provided under "WHO BROUGHT ISSUE". Thus, if a parent asked a question because a teacher asked her about the topic, enter a check (✓) on the line next to parent then, in the space provided, enter 'rep of teacher'. See item 5 for definitions of most descriptors.

   Committee refers to a formal group assigned a task. A representative of the committee may raise a question or issue to the council.

8. **DECISION PROCESS**

Discussion: After discussion of the issue or question is completed place a check (✓) on the line next to the descriptor that best represents the discussion. Place a check next to

calm if information was presented or questions asked or positions stated in a direct, unemotional manner.

emotional if information was presented, questions asked, or positions stated in a way that appeals to or agitates feelings or sensibilities. May include anger, disgust, threats, or ecstatic support.

mixed if both calm and emotional instances occurred during the discussion.

none if no discussion occurred on the issue.

Led by:

On the line to the left of the descriptor, place a check (✓) to indicate who led the discussion A discussion leader is one who guides or directs the discussion or who exerts commanding authority or influence over the discussion. This person may or may not be the chairperson.

On the line to the right of the descriptor, place a number, 0 through 3, to indicate how much the group participated in the discussion relative to the others: **0 = no participation**
1 = little participation
2 = some participation
3 = most active participation

Process: Place a check (✓) on the line to indicate how a decision regarding the issue was made.

vote when a majority viewpoint is counted and prevails
consensus when each participant is given opportunity to agree with the decision and all participants do agree
compromise when mutual concessions were made to reach agreement
assigned to committee when a group is asked to study the issue
principal decided when the principal makes the decision without being asked to do so
tabled when the issue is removed from consideration indefinitely
no decision when no decision is reached
other when something is done with the issue other than ones listed on the observation instrument. Explain 'other' on the back of the paper.
implied concensus when no on disagrees with a decision or a suggestion or it seems that all agree but individuals are not specifically asked if they agree.
sought input from expert when a decision is delayed until information is obtained from an expert
asked superior to decide when an authority figure is asked to decide. This authority may be a principal, central staff person, or other authority on the topic.

9. **OUTCOME**. Enter the decision in the space provided.

10. **REACTION**

Generally group: Place a check (✓) on the line next to the item that best indicates the group's reaction to the decision. Check

pleased if the total group is smiling or otherwise indicating that they are satisfied with the decision.
disgruntled if some group members complain or otherwise indicate that they are not satisfied with the decision. This may occur after the meeting is adjourned. Briefly explain disgruntled in the space provided.

Discussion time: Place a check (✓) on the line next to the item that best indicates the discussion time for the issue. Check

very short if discussion was completed in less than 5 minutes
average if discussion was completed in 5 to 30 minutes
extended if discussion continued for more than 30 minutes

Illustration of Some Key
Findings from Process/Product
Documentation over a 15 Month
Period (Etheridge, Hall, Brown, and Lucas, 1990).

Principals were key to facilitating or inhibiting establishment of a cooperative council that shared decisions.

Other key factors that facilitated Implementation of SBDM:

1. When principals gave local school council chairspersons freedom to lead the councils, the councils' progression toward a cooperative working style was facilitated.

2. Implementation was facilitated when teachers demonstrated willingness to engage the SBDM process and advocated for their own access to decision making.

3. Delivery of teamwork training to school professional staffs through intense weekend workshops fostered cohesion among school faculty and was related to increased teacher efforts to gain inclusion in decisions.

4. Availability of the project director and professional association representative as facilitators from outside of the individual schools served to keep teachers informed and motivated especially when they felt excluded from decision making.

Several Factors Inhibited Sucess:

1. Some principals had the most difficulty changing from the topdown bureaucratic order of school governance to the horizontal, shared decision making mode. This was not surprising since there is a long history of principals having total control in their schools. It, however, slowed the transition to SBDM.

2. Though over 50 training sessions were held for SBDM participants, most participants concurred that there was not enough training. The nature of needed training varied by participant group and school.

3. After fifteen months, some participants still did not understand their roles. This inhibited communication between council and teachers and fostered conflict among teachers and between teachers and principal.

4. Schools worked in relative isolation from each other as they implemented SBDM. Two factors were related to this situation: lack of a formal mechanism through which schools could communicate and informal competition among schools.

5. Some central office staff felt disenfranchised and therefore were not facilitating toward the program.

APPENDIX B

Table 1

Percent Agreement (4-5) and Means, School Climate Items

	Percent Agree							Means						
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SCALE I. ORDER														
13 Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced. +	82	57	52	21	86	70	29	4.28	3.60	3.30	2.18	4.48	3.79	2.67
23 Student discipline is administered fairly and appropriately. +	77	73	63	15	82	64	29	4.31	3.80	3.22	2.15	4.27	3.79	2.92
25 Student misbehavior interferes with teaching. -	51	53	48	65	41	55	54	3.29	3.33	3.33	3.94	3.10	3.48	3.42
30 Student tardiness and absence is a problem. -	41	20	37	79	54	88	88	3.34	2.93	2.96	4.27	3.71	4.46	4.50
39 The school is a safe and secure place in which to work. +	64	60	67	27	74	82	75	3.77	3.27	3.63	2.38	4.11	4.41	3.88
44 Joint responsibilities for student discipline exists. +	72	57	48	15	41	55	17	4.05	3.43	3.15	2.39	3.32	3.58	2.38
46 Student behavior is generally positive in this school. +	69	57	41	0	50	91	25	3.82	3.40	3.04	1.77	3.35	4.27	2.87
SCALE II: ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP														
8 The administration communicates the belief that all students can learn.+	97	87	93	71	96	85	83	4.77	4.31	4.56	3.97	4.73	4.49	4.04
20 The administration encourages teachers to be creative. +	92	70	85	77	96	64	54	4.82	3.80	4.33	4.24	4.64	3.73	3.46
34 The principal provides feedback on staff performance. +	87	73	78	77	82	70	58	4.63	3.97	3.81	4.03	4.70	4.00	3.63
36 The administration does not protect instructional time. -	13	23	19	32	23	59	50	2.21	2.17	2.22	2.97	2.33	3.17	3.42
42 The principal provides strong instructional leadership. +	90	75	70	53	86	58	42	4.55	4.13	3.78	3.68	4.65	3.44	3.21
45 School goals are reviewed and updated. +	90	53	67	50	73	73	38	4.59	3.55	3.74	3.59	4.16	4.07	3.25
47 The principal is highly visible throughout the school. +	90	70	82	80	82	94	63	4.44	3.93	4.27	4.12	4.55	4.55	3.79
SCALE III: SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT														
7 Faculty and staff feel they are important. +	90	67	89	47	91	64	38	4.56	3.73	4.48	3.33	4.50	3.84	3.04
9 Varied learning environments are provided. +	87	70	70	53	82	58	54	4.33	3.67	3.96	3.67	4.18	3.61	3.50
10 The school building is neat, bright, clean, and comfortable. +	69	7	44	24	82	73	88	3.90	1.90	3.44	2.47	4.14	3.91	4.33
14 Employees and students show respect for each other. +	80	17	52	26	68	55	33	4.13	2.77	3.41	2.62	3.76	3.71	2.96
29 An atmosphere of trust exist. +	80	37	74	32	59	30	21	4.21	2.90	3.74	2.94	3.68	2.68	2.58
38 Teachers reflect pride in this school and its students. +	95	87	89	53	82	82	67	4.67	4.10	4.33	3.59	4.53	4.45	3.63
49 People in this school really care about each other. +	87	27	82	38	59	79	25	4.42	3.00	3.96	3.03	4.12	4.19	2.81

Table 1 (continued)

Percent Agreement (4-5) and Means, School Climate Items

	Percent Agree							Means						
School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SCALE IV: COMMUNITY/SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT														
5 Community businesses are active in the school. +	64	27	44	32	41	24	29	3.89	2.29	3.00	2.87	3.18	2.96	2.71
11 Parents are involved in a home-school support network. +	82	27	33	24	32	24	13	4.13	2.87	3.15	2.53	3.00	2.59	2.04
12 Parents are treated courteously. +	90	80	93	85	96	88	88	4.62	4.27	4.44	4.21	4.50	4.46	4.29
18 Parents are invited to serve on school advisory committees. +	95	87	89	71	96	76	83	4.80	4.41	4.37	4.18	4.64	4.28	4.04
19 Parent volunteers are used wherever possible. +	98	80	56	50	59	55	38	4.80	3.93	4.19	3.62	3.64	3.74	3.25
32 A school newsletter or bulletin communicates information. +	46	46	41	59	23	27	17	3.16	3.41	2.96	3.68	2.90	2.56	2.30
37 Parents are invited to visit classrooms. +	95	87	93	71	77	91	58	4.69	4.30	4.41	4.09	4.25	4.49	3.75
SCALE V. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM														
4 Teachers use a variety of teaching strategies or models. +	82	93	89	68	82	73	63	4.45	4.40	4.42	3.85	4.55	4.23	3.75
15 Teachers sequence learning so that students experience success. +	95	90	89	59	86	88	54	4.54	4.31	4.23	3.85	4.24	4.19	3.55
24 Students have opportunities to develop higher -order skills. +	92	86	89	74	82	76	62	4.54	4.07	4.15	3.94	4.38	4.19	3.74
33 Curriculum guides insure coverage of subject content. +	85	87	82	85	68	85	83	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.52	4.08
35 Appropriate evaluation methods are used to assess learning. +	92	90	89	82	82	88	83	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.45	4.60	4.13
41 Pull out programs disrupt and interfere with basic skills instruction. -	18	23	22	32	23	33	54	2.41	2.59	3.32	3.21	2.45	3.21	3.44
48 Teachers use a wide range of teaching materials. +	95	50	81	74	82	79	63	4.69	3.30	4.11	4.21	4.35	4.31	3.65
SCALE VI: STUDENT EXPECTATIONS/RESPONSIBILITIES														
2 Low achieving students are given opportunity to succeed. +	97	87	88	68	86	85	67	4.74	4.20	4.33	4.13	4.57	4.39	3.83
3 School rules and expectations are clearly defined and communicated. +	85	70	52	50	82	70	38	4.45	3.86	3.72	3.41	4.48	3.97	3.25
17 Students share responsibility for the school environment. +	79	60	44	21	65	52	21	4.10	3.63	3.26	2.38	3.55	3.44	2.63
21 Students are held responsible for their actions. +	77	67	59	41	91	76	38	4.38	3.82	3.48	2.85	4.27	4.06	2.83
22 Many students are not expected to master basic skills. -	28	17	19	29	23	27	17	2.26	2.00	1.92	2.59	1.73	2.50	2.46
27 Many students do not participate in school activities. -	8	7	7	12	14	30	13	1.41	1.60	1.48	1.94	2.00	2.55	2.17
43 Teachers hold high expectations for students. +	97	93	85	59	77	67	42	4.67	4.43	4.19	3.77	4.15	4.07	3.44

Table 1 (continued)

Percent Agreement (4-5) and Means, School Climate Items

		Percent Agree							Means						
	School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SCALE VII: STAFF AND STUDENT COLLABORATION															
1	The faculty and staff share a sense of commitment to the school's goals.	+92	70	96	53	96	82	58	4.66	3.90	4.44	3.47	4.64	4.70	3.67
6	Students are encouraged to help others with problems.	+ 85	63	48	47	77	64	33	4.31	3.60	3.58	3.29	4.14	3.93	2.92
16	Teacher communication is encouraged.	+ 89	60	81	50	91	58	42	4.44	3.60	4.15	3.50	4.32	3.47	3.08
26	Students participate in solving the school problems.	+ 67	37	44	38	50	36	21	3.87	3.00	3.15	3.12	3.63	3.03	2.79
28	Cooperation exists among the faculty and staff.	+ 77	43	81	29	77	61	38	4.51	3.20	4.11	2.97	4.55	3.75	3.08
31	Teachers need to participate more in school decision-making.	- 33	63	45	65	45	76	75	3.33	3.68	3.41	3.74	3.35	4.39	4.25
40	Most problems can be solved without outside help.	+ 72	50	52	50	54	49	46	3.92	3.47	3.22	3.18	3.40	3.44	3.13

Table 2

School Climate Scale by Means by School

School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Order	25.59	23.23	22.04	14.68	24.46	23.85	18.79
Leadership	31.44	27.47	28.19	26.62	30.36	26.76	23.96
Environment	30.18	22.07	27.15	21.62	28.32	26.15	22.88
Involvement	30.03	25.47	26.48	25.18	26.00	24.82	22.42
Instruction	29.82	27.37	27.74	27.62	28.09	28.61	26.21
Expectation	30.56	28.27	27.48	23.85	28.96	26.73	23.33
Collaboration	28.36	23.13	25.22	21.79	27.09	23.70	20.42

Worksheet 1: School Climate Data Summary

school _____
group _____

	date ____	N= ____	date ____	N= ____	
Order					
13. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced. (+)					
23. Student discipline is administered fairly and appropriately. (+)					
25. Student misbehavior interferes with teaching. (-)					
30. Student tardiness and absence is a problem. (-)					
39. The school is a safe and secure place in which to work. (+)					
44. Joint responsibility for student discipline exists. (+)					
46. Student behavior is generally positive in this school. (+)					
Scale Norms Elementary					
Junior/Middle					
Senior					
Special					
School Norms mean					
T score					

Leadership					
8. The administration communicates that all students can learn. (+)					
20. The administration encourages teachers to be creative. (+)					
34. The principal provides feedback on staff performance. (+)					
36. The administration does not protect instructional time. (-)					
42. The principal provides strong instructional leadership. (+)					
45. School goals are reviewed and updated. (+)					
47. The principal is highly visible throughout the school. (+)					
Scale Norms Elementary					
Junior/Middle					
Senior					
Special					
School Norms mean					
T score					

APPENDIX C

INDICATORS OFSUCCESS

LONG RANGE GOALS	CAT	Student Attendance Records	Student Pregnancy Rates	Student Dropout Rate	Incidences of Vandalism	Faculty Attendance Rates	Faculty Turnover Rates	Teacher - Parent Contacts (teacher logs)
1. Establish school based decision making as a functional means of running the school.						X	X	
2. Establish instructional programs, services, and patterns that lead to improved student learning.	X							
3. Establish a school atmosphere that leads to improved teaching and learning.	X					X	X	
4. Decrease dropout rates.				X				
5. Decrease pregnancy rates among adolescents.			X					
6. Decrease school vandalism.					X			
7. Decrease incidence rate of other student misbehavior.								X
8. Increase student attendance rates.		X						
9. Increase parent and community involvement in the schools.								X
10. Improve students' self concept/esteem, as a learner.								

Additional indicators on the next page

INDICATORS OFSUCCESS

Long Range Goals	Student Suspension Rates	Attitudes of students		Nature of Improvement Plan	Observations	Interviews	Decisions by Council	School Climate Inventory	Parent Involvement (teacher logs)	Parent Participation (sign-in sheets)
		Self-Concept Inventory	Classroom Climate Inventory							
1. Establish school based decision making as a functional means of running the school.				X	X	X	X			
2. Establish instructional programs, services, and patterns that lead to improved student learning.		X	X	X		X		X		
3. Establish a school atmosphere that leads to improved teaching and learning.			X	X		X		X		
4. Decrease dropout rates.										
5. Decrease pregnancy rates among adolescents.										
6. Decrease school vandalism.										
7. Decrease incidence rate of other student misbehavior.	X									
8. Increase student attendance rates.										
9. Increase parent and community involvement in the schools.						X			X	X
10. Improve students' self concept/esteem, as a learner.		X	X							